REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claim 4 remains allowed. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,946,629) in view of Blanchard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,408,191). Sawyer et al. discloses a cellular telephone network having short message service interaction with other networks; Blanchard et al. discloses an arrangement for displaying message screens on a telephone terminal.

Please amend Claim 1 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 1 and 3 under §103(a), the Examiner states that Sawyer et al. fails to disclose determining whether a forwarding function is set for a called mobile terminal in the MC; and transmitting the SMS message to a destination mobile terminal if it is determined that the forwarding function is set. The Examiner states that Blanchard et al. cures this defect and cites col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 6 as disclosing this element. In particular, col. 4, lines 2-6 state, "This store and forward functionality enables the message center to forward the SMS message to the telephone terminal at the appropriate time for conveying it to the user of the telephone terminal."

Each of Claims 1 and 3 of the present application recites three (3) distinct mobile terminals, namely, a calling mobile terminal, a called mobile terminal, _and_ a destination mobile terminal. If the forwarding function is set, an SMS message sent from the calling terminal is not sent to the called mobile terminal, but instead is sent to the destination mobile terminal. Claim 3 additionally recites three (3) MCs, namely, a calling MC, a called MC, and a destination MC.

There are only two (2) entities disclosed by Blanchard et al., a calling terminal and a called terminal relating to its "store and forward" function. The forwarding function of Blanchard et al. enables a user of a called terminal to set a time to receive an SMS message (left by the

calling terminal) from a message center. There are no calling, called **_and_** destination terminals disclosed in Blanchard et al.

There are only two (2) entities disclosed by Sawyer et al., a calling and a called terminal. The called terminal of Sawyer et al. is a destination terminal; they are one in the same terminal. There are no calling, called **_and_** destination terminals disclosed in Sawyer et al.

The Examiner asserts that Sawyer teaches on col. 2 lines 20-25 a destination terminal of the present invention. However, the destination terminal of Sawyer is a called mobile terminal when a SMS transmitted from another network, not from a cellular network, is transmitted to the cellular network. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that regarding the called mobile terminal of Sawyer as the destination terminal of the claims of the present application is not proper.

As neither Sawyer et al. nor Blanchard et al., alone or in combination, teach or disclose these elements, the rejections must be withdrawn.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1 and 3 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 3 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claim 2, this is likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on its respective amended independent claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-4, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/MJM/dr